Behind Kasavubu's Victory, P. 3

How U.S. Weakened Betancourt in Venezuela, Page 2; On Those National Goals, P. 2; Rankin's Legacy P. 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 44 DECEMBER 5, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

On the Norstad Plan to Make NATO A Nuclear Power

The growing campaign to make NATO "a fourth nuclear power" (it would really be the fifth, now that France has the A-bomb) is a prime example of the way crucial decisions are brought about with a maximum of secrecy and a minimum of public consultation. In Britain, Edward Heath, Minister for European Affairs, told the House of Commons Nov. 28 the British government had not been consulted before Gen. Norstad unveiled his NATO "atomic pool" plan to the NATO parliamentarians in Paris. Here the study report by Robert B. Bowie on which the Norstad plan is supposedly based remains a classified document. Mr. Bowie, now at Harvard, where he prepared the report, was formerly head of the State Department's policy planning staff. He lives and works in that little closed society of the military and their academic adjutants to which ordinary mortals are denied access, and where traditional democratic safeguards do not apply.

Every Salesman's Dream

The result is that key advisers of the incoming Administration and key members of Congress are being asked to line up for the plan without being told what it really calls for. According to a story by Murray Marder in the *Washington Post* Nov. 26, an unusual last-minute conference was held in New York the night before by Philip J. Farley, special assistant to the Secretary of State for disarmament and atomic energy, with Congressman Chet Holifield, who will be chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and four other members of the committee. They were about to leave on a two-week tour of nuclear missile bases abroad which will give Gen. Norstad a chance to "brief", i.e. to indoctrinate them. Mr. Farley met with them to discuss the Administration proposal. The discussion could not have been too enlightening since it appears from Mr. Marder's story (1) that the Joint Committee was refused permission to see the Bowie report, (2) that "not even the Atomic Energy Commission has had any document placed before it" and (3) that the plan itself is not only still secret but "some of its operating details remain to be agreed upon within the government." Every salesman will appreciate the advantages of being allowed to sell a product without giving the customer too close a look.

The headlines in last Sunday's *New York Times* (Nov. 27) gave the impression that the NATO parliamentarians approved the Norstad plan. "Spaak Endorses Control by NATO Over Atom Arms," said the headlines. "Calls Norstad Plan Best Way to Bolster Alliance's Defense and Unity. Legislators Approve." The truth is that while the NATO parliamentarians agreed that the NATO nations should have more voice in the use of nuclear missiles "they declined to take steps toward making NATO a nuclear power on its own" (Associated Press from Paris, *Washington Star* Nov. 27). From a military and political point of view, the Norstad plan raises many questions. How, for example, do 15 nations decide when to pull the trigger? How will this be giving Western Europe an independent nuclear deterrent when the U.S. will still be one of the fifteen, able to veto NATO's use of nuclear arms?

The Norstad plan is a way to get around reluctance to make the Germans a nuclear power. It is significant that only Bonn is on record whole-heartedly for it. This would give the German troops in NATO their chance to train in the use of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, supplied by the U.S. The plan is favored by the growing missile industry in our own country which sees the spread of these monsters as the guarantee of an expanding market, and by our simple-minded military who figure that if X number of nuclear weapons are a deterrent, then several times that many will be that much greater a deterrent. A world bristling with nuclear missiles, some hidden in "hardened" bases, some prowling under the seas, others giddily travelling around Europe and the U.S.A. on railroad cars and eventually a stockpile of them in orbit overhead is their idea of a stable universe. The Norstad plan is a phase of this madness.

Those Ugly Faces Are Our Own

Much was said in the campaign of Mr. Eisenhower's failure to exert the moral power of his office. Mr. Kennedy was to provide a vigorous new voice in our national life. But the President and the President-elect are equally silent on the ugly situation in New Orleans. Mr. Kennedy talked inspiringly during the campaign of leading us all on a crusade to a new frontier. The most important frontier in our society is the establishment of the Negro's right to be a first class citizen, and of his children's right to grow up without the stigma of compulsory apartness. This is also our most dangerous frontier, and Mr. Kennedy seems loath to approach it. He has to "live with" the South, as the practical men around him must be saying. But for his silence and his palsied arm, we who are white are all to blame. The President and the President-elect are alike prisoners of an atmosphere we all accept. It is compounded of hopelessness about the moral imbecility which racism has created in the South, and of a fundamental racial indifference. This is happening to black men, not to us. So we turn easily from it to the sports pages. Those ugly faces screaming "nigger lover" are only the nightmarish distortion of a white supremacy from which we all benefit and in which we all more or less acquiesce. The failure is not just Mr. Eisenhower's or Mr. Kennedy's. It is ours.

We dedicate these lines in sorrow to the memory of Richard Wright, who has just died in Paris.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

High Inspirational and Lofty Spiritual Tone Shows Earlier Misgivings Baseless

A National Goals Report With No Taint of Economic Planning

Those with the patience to read through the report of the President's Commission on National Goals will find quite a few gems. One of our favorites is the Commission's finding, "we should be highly selective in our space objectives and unexcelled in their pursuit." This has a ring of high cosmic exclusiveness.

As a newspaperman, we also liked the tactful way the Commission hinted that maybe our instruments of mass communication could improve their communicating. "Mass circulation periodicals," the report suggested, "have opportunities beyond their current performance." It was no less tender with TV. "Television," said the report circumspectly, "although it has improved, can do better still in communicating serious ideas." This should spare Gen. Sarnoff's feelings.

No People on Earth Sees More Westerns

We also enjoyed the whipped cream phraseology of the passage which says, "The American people remain among the best informed in the world, but their sources of information must steadily be enriched to cope with ever more complex problems." We hope this doesn't mean fewer Westerns.

Among our other favorites was the Commission's stern admonition, "Special interest groups must operate legitimately," and its clarion call "Knowledge and innovation must be advanced on every front." We also liked the down-to-earth quality of "We must use available manpower more efficiently"; the oracular, "The way to preserve freedom is to live it"; and the inspirational, "Above all, Americans must demonstrate in every aspect of their lives the fallacy of a purely selfish attitude—the materialistic ethic."

The idea of a "goals" commission was first proposed to Mr. Eisenhower during a White House visit the evening of January 5, 1959, just before the annual message, by Charles H. Percy of Bell & Howells, Chicago.

Mr. Eisenhower was enthusiastic but his White House aides soon began to worry. "The trouble," as Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the *New York Herald Tribune* explained (Jan. 26, 1959) in a story we squirreled away at the time, "lies in the word 'goals'. Presidential advisers don't want to set up a committee that would establish precise goals because they fear the next step would be economic planning." Indeed the *Weekly* at the time (Jan. 19, 1959) had already hailed the idea as "A first, faint step in this direction" and the national executive committee of the Socialist Party, perhaps with tongue-in-cheek, had also given the President's proposal a comradely welcome.

As one worried official said to Mr. Slevins, "Suppose the committee said there ought to be 100,000 new schoolrooms or 1,000,000 new homes a year and then they weren't built. Why everybody in the country would be demanding that the Federal government step in and see to it that they get built." What, indeed, if the committee went further on this dangerous path and set goals for steel or autos or aluminum?

We are happy to report these anxieties were unfounded. Mr. Greenwalt of du Pont and Mr. Pace of General Dynamics, flanked by such stalwarts as Mr. Meany of the AFL-CIO, Mr. Canham of the *Christian Science Monitor* and General Gruenther of the American Red Cross, resisted all such crypto-Marxist temptations. Nowhere does the report even mention goals for industry. "The economy," it says with shining orthodoxy, "should grow at the maximum rate consistent with primary dependence upon free enterprise. . . ." "Free enterprise" comes first, even ahead of growth and progress.

Sackcloth and Ashes Dept.

Dear Izzy: **You know I have the greatest admiration for the way you handle legal matters, but this time you went off on the wrong foot. The Chaunt case that you mentioned [Weekly of Nov. 21] was not a deportation case and was not unanimous. Nor was the issue merely one of the distribution of leaflets.**

The fact is that Chaunt was a denaturalization case. The denaturalization was sought on the basis of Communist membership and failing to disclose certain arrests. It is true that one of these arrests had to do with the distribution of leaflets, but there were others as well. The Court of Appeals had passed only on the failure to disclose and not on the Communist aspect of the case. The Supreme Court, Justices Clark, Whittaker and Stewart dissenting, sent the case back for consideration of the Communist issues.

Sincerely yours, *Osmond K. Fraenkel*

How Slippery U.S. Policy on Trujillo Undermined Betancourt in Venezuela

"The government of President Romulo Betancourt sank into a morass of inter-party conflict and uncertainty regarding Cuba and Cuban Premier Fidel Castro. At the San Jose de Costa Rica Foreign Ministers' Conference of the Organization of Latin American States (OAS) in August, Foreign Minister Ignacio Luis Arcayo had refused to cooperate with the coalition government's policy of coolness toward the Cuban regime. . . . Welcomed as a hero by his party, the Union Republicana Democratica (URD), and by other pro-Castro factions, Arcaya tendered his resignation as Foreign Minister. . . . [His party has since left the 3-party coalition behind Betancourt-IFS].

"At the OAS conference in San Jose, Venezuela participated in what many considered to be a barter deal with the U.S. In exchange for cooperation in the Venezuelan campaign against Dominican dictator Trujillo, the Venezuelan government, apparently very much against the will of its constituency, went along with the U.S.-inspired censure of the Cuban regime. Betancourt's shaky position was made even more precarious in September when the Department of Agriculture announced that, instead of participating in the economic boycott of the Dominican Republic, it would increase its sugar purchases from there to 232,000 tons. . . .

"The Venezuelan government sent an immediate note of protest to Washington. . . . The U.S. State Dept. explained in its answer that it had acted in accordance with the wording of the San Jose declaration, which referred only to the breaking of diplomatic relations and the ceasing of arms sales to the Dominican Republic. . . . The Venezuelan reaction was that the U.S. had found a legal loophole to avoid carrying out the spirit of the San Jose meeting. President Betancourt, who had already lost a competent and statesmanlike foreign minister and had come dangerously close to losing control of his government as a result of his gamble on U.S. cooperation, made no official comment."

—*Hispanic American Report, Stanford Univ. Nov. 1960*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How the State Dept. Is Working for a Belgian Big Business Take-Over in the Congo

Behind That Vote to Seat Kasavubu's Delegates at the UN

A series of recent events, most of which got little publicity in the American press, indicates clearly enough just what is our government's policy in the Congo. One item was the visit paid Nov. 21 by our Ambassador Timberlake to Elisabethville, capital of the secessionist Katanga, where he was welcomed by its self-proclaimed President Moise Tshombe. "He is the first foreign ambassador to visit Katanga," the AP dispatch from Elisabethville* noted significantly "since the provincial regime announced secession from the Congo, July 11." This will encourage the movement to separate from the Congo its richest territory where (as may be seen from the adjoining box) Union Minière du Haut Katanga in which the Rockefellers are interested is doing business as usual.

Visa Control as UN Control

A second item, indicating how far we are prepared to go to get our way in the Congo, was the refusal of the U.S. to give Thomas Kanza, Lumumba's delegate to the United Nations, a visa to come here for the General Assembly debate on the Congo. The U.S. delegation at the UN explained (according to an *AP* dispatch, *Washington Post,* Nov. 12) that Kanza had made his request for a visa when Kasavubu flew to New York "but it was not in proper form." Kanza was the Congo's spokesman before the Security Council last summer.

A third and the most revealing item of all was, of course, the swift reaction of the State Department to the release of the Dayal report and the accompanying correspondence in which the authorities of Belgium and the Katanga rejected Hammarskjold's demand for the removal of Belgian military and civilian advisers who were disrupting UN operations in the Congo. The State Department release of Nov. 4 saying that it had "every confidence in the good faith of Belgium" disregarded the evidence of Belgium's take-over (see box below for another picture of what the Belgians are doing) and undercut UN authority in the Congo.

A fourth item was the earliest indication of U.S. displeasure with the UN operation in the Congo. It concerned the celebration held by UN troops in Leopoldville to mark the 15th anniversary of the UN: Our Ambassador and those of the other Western powers boycotted the ceremony (according to an AP dispatch in the *New York Herald-Tribune* Oct. 25) "to mark their displeasure with current UN policy."

On the eve of Kasavubu's appearance at the UN, the U.S. decided to back him because the UN plan was to bring back the Congolese parliament, and because we feared parliament would restore Lumumba. Kasavubu was favored because he "has been generally backing Col. Mobutu" and we "tend now to favor a strong executive" (all this was spelled out in a background briefing reported by John Hightower, the AP's State Dept. man in the *Washington Star* Nov. 6). In plain language, we prefer a military dictatorship in the Congo.

However ill-informed the U.S. public may be, all this is clearly understood by the African nationalist elite. We managed to split the African bloc and obtain enough French African votes to seat the Kasavubu delegation at the UN, though over the opposition of the European and Asian neutrals. Ireland and Sweden voted against us, as did India, Indonesia and Ceylon. Countries as friendly to the U.S. as Canada, Israel, Pakistan, Liberia, Mexico and Venezuela abstained while Nigeria declined to participate after appealing to the Assembly to take no action until the UN conciliation commission could reach the Congo. The final vote was 50 to 32 with 14 abstentions and three countries not participating, a thin victory. The price of it was loss of faith in the U.S. as a champion of constitutional government and in the UN as a trustworthy friend of the colonial peoples. As Mr. Aw of Mali said during the debate, "The Congo is becoming the tombstone of our hopes."

Business As Usual in Katanga

"Despite the widespread chaos that crippled the Congo after independence arrived last June 30 the company's [Union Miniere du Haut Katanga] mines, processing plants, smelters and hydro-electric installations have kept on functioning smoothly . . . only two days' operations were lost last July. The rest of the time the mining and smelting continued on a normal three-shifts-a-day basis, six days a week. . . ."

—"Belgian Mines Still Thriving in the Congo", Canadian Press dispatch from Elisabethville, Katanga province, New York Herald-Tribune, November 27.

*** York, Pa., Gazette & Daily, Nov. 22, the only place I saw this AP dispatch.**

A Vivid Associated Press Report on Why the Belgians Want the UN Out

"A new and formidable military challenge faces the UN in the Congo. Exasperated UN officials say the challenge comes mainly from Belgian officers who have rejoined Congolese army units. . . . The Belgian officers—like their civilian colleagues in the Congolese government offices—have two main objectives:

"1. To prevent at all cost the return to power of former Premier Patrice Lumumba who leans toward the Communists. 2. To preserve as far as possible the privileged position of Belgian commercial interests in the Congo.

"The presence of the UN force is a threat to both these objectives. The UN mission is bound by its charter to uphold parliamentary government. In the nation's political turmoil this inevitably favors Mr. Lumumba. And among all the squabbling political leaders, only Mr. Lumumba is likely to upset the 80-year old Belgian commercial hegemony. . . . Top UN officials say this opposition [by 'Belgian and Western interests'] seeks to build up the Congolese army as the backing for a pro-Belgian puppet regime. . . . Prominent UN officials say it [the army] is held together only with the help of Belgian officers and money provided by Belgian firms operating in the Congo. . . .

"All normal tax collection has broken down in the Congo and Belgian firms claim they are within their rights in contributing equivalent amounts to the upkeep of Mobutu's pro-Western regime.

"A month ago, before the Belgian interests had organized their military aid, the UN spent more than $60,000 to pay the overdue wages of Col. Mobutu's unruly troops. 'But never again,' one senior UN official said ruefully."

—Michael Goldsmith from Leopoldville, Associated Press dispatch, Washington Evening Star, Oct. 26

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What the Newspapers Forgot to Mention in Their Obituaries of John Rankin

How The Racist from Mississippi Saved the Un-American Committee

Two things were missing in the newspaper obituaries of former Congressman Rankin of Mississippi. One was a clear appraisal of his peculiar radicalism. This mixed attacks on Wall Street and the power trust (he helped George Norris establish the TVA) with the kind of attacks on Negroes, Jews and liberals never before (or since) heard in the House of Representatives. This mixture of Anti-Semitism and lower middle class radicalism was a home-grown variant of the same ideological stew served up by Hitler.

The other missing item was mention of Rankin's greatest parliamentary achievement—the establishment of the Un-American Activities Committee as a standing committee of the House just when it seemed to be on its way out. Perhaps it might have seemed untactful to mention that these professional snoopers after un-Americanism owed their postwar existence to about as clearly un-American a Congressman as ever sat in the House.

When Martin Dies Retired

The story may be found told in full in Prof. Robert K. Carr's book on the Un-American committee. The committee had grown increasingly inactive during the war years. In 1944, its chairman, Martin Dies, announced that he would not stand for reelection. Since the committee was a one-man show, and had made itself notorious in the prewar period by becoming so obviously an anti-New Deal sounding board, the retirement of its chairman seemed to signal its demise.

Normally a new resolution would have been required to continue the committee during the new Congress and the chances were that such a resolution would be buried by the leadership in the Rules committee which was then headed by a liberal, Sabath of Chicago. Rankin, however, outsmarted the leadership. When the Congress met on January 3, 1945, and Chairman Sabath had offered the usual resolution declaring the rules of the previous Congress in effect during the new, Rankin moved an amendment making Un-American Activities a standing committee of the House.

Since the rules had not yet been adopted and no committees were yet functioning, the Rankin amendment could not be referred to committee for hearings but had to be voted on at once. It was first defeated 134 to 146 against the amendment. But when Rankin asked, and obtained the requisite one-fifth of the membership for, a record vote, the amendment passed by 207 to 186 with 40 members not voting.

The vote was the first victory in the postwar Congress of the coalition between Republicans and Southern Democrats. The Democrats were split, 150 against the committee and 70 for it. The Republicans were split the other way, 34 against the Committee and 137 for it. (One Progressive and one Farmer-Laborite in the House also voted against the Committee). Of the 70 Democrats for the Committee, all but 7 were Southern Democrats.

Some day when there is a cleaner atmosphere in the country, the Committee may be abolished by the same tactic which Rankin used to establish it—an amendment to the rules on opening day when it cannot be shunted off for burial in the Rules committee. But that day is still a long way off.

The New American Decalogue

"Americans, at present, 'obsessed' with freedom and a desire to extend it, are being deluded by 'cheap definitions' of the way to do so, a theologian said here yesterday.

"Current commandments for the preservation of freedom, the Rev. Dr. Liston Pope, Dean of Yale Divinity School said, might go like this:

"Thou shalt manufacture hydrogen bombs, and they will keep you free. . . . Thou shalt suppress the Communist in thy midst. . . . Thou shalt keep the alien from the shores by immigration bills. . . .

"Thou shalt stir up suspicion and fear in the land, that men may be afraid to voice unpopular convictions. . . . Thou shalt require loyalty oaths to insure that public employees and university professors are either patriots or liars. . . . Thou shalt have no other gods before free enterprise. . . ."

—Washington Post, Nov. 22

NEWS FLASH AT PRESS TIME: A National Conference on Reform of the Rules to End Minority Control of Congress will be held in Washington Dec. 28. Organizations wishing to take part should wire the coordinator, Wm. Taylor, Americans for Democratic Action, 1314 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

12/5/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; 6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED